

**MINUTES OF THE
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 6, 2007**

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on March 6, 2007 at 7:24 p.m. by Chairman Merz in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Kosla, Smith, Thompson, Worthington, Chrm. Merz

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Will Wong, Community Development Director; Reg Murray, Senior Planner; Steve Geiger, Associate Planner; Sue Fraizer, Administrative Assistant

ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER

ITEM II: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the February 20, 2007 meeting were approved as submitted.

ITEM III: PUBLIC COMMENT

Bernie Schroeder of the Public Works Department introduced the new Assistant Civil Engineer, Courtney Barrett.

ITEM IV: PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. Tentative Parcel Map and Tree Permit – 230 Live Oak Street (Walker Parcel Map) – Files LS 06-2; TP 06-5.** The applicant requests approval of a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide an approximate .85 acre parcel located at 230 Live Oak Street into three (3) parcels approximately 8,046 square feet, 12,876 square feet, and 14, 490 square feet in size. The request also includes a Tree Permit to address impacts to protected trees.

Planner Geiger gave the staff report. Parcel 1 will be a “flag” lot and will meet the City’s frontage and size requirements. Access to the existing residence is currently provided by a gravel driveway located along the south property line. As a condition of the parcel map approval, the driveway will be

required to be widened to a width of 20 feet and paved to serve all three parcels. As a condition of approval, Parcels 2 and 3 will be granted an easement to use the driveway for access. A maintenance agreement will also be required so that all three properties share in the costs of maintaining the driveway.

Planner Geiger reviewed the requirements for parking, grading, frontage improvements, sewer and water, as well as the requirements for the tree permit as stated in the staff report.

Comm. Kosla asked how the maintenance agreement would be written.

Planner Geiger replied that it would be written by an attorney, reviewed by City staff, and recorded with the Placer County Recorder.

Comm. Merz asked why street widening, curb, gutter and sidewalk are not being required as it was for the lot split on Electric Street.

Bernie Schroeder with the City of Auburn Public Works Department stated that the Department looked at the area and determined it was not appropriate to make such a requirement due to the rural nature of the area. Other considerations were that the road is not wide enough and no other properties on the street have curb, gutter and sidewalk.

The public hearing was opened.

The applicant Mike Walker of 3636 Larkin Lane in Auburn introduced himself and said he is available for any questions.

Larry Alberts of 226 Live Oak Street lives adjacent to the property. He passed out a document to the Commission showing 23 signatures of surrounding property owners who are opposed to this project. The areas of concern are: 1) Andrews Street is the only entrance, and this is a single lane road with parking on one side only. 2) The sewer system is 100 years old and there are existing issues with sewer backups. 3) When Mr. Weber on Andrews St. previously applied for a lot split, the Planning Commission denied the request due to narrow streets and sewer issues.

Christina Schulz of 260 Live Oak Street lives next door to the subject property. She passed out pictures to the Commission showing the narrow street, and her property line. She asked if

the driveway at the proposed project will be placed right next to her home.

Denise Yeager of 218 Live Oak Street stated that when a car is parked on the street, the remaining width is 11'4".

Fred Yeager of 218 Live Oak Street stated that not only is there a sewer problem, there is also a drainage problem. He feels this area is not suitable for the density this project would create. He stated there needs to be parking available on the street. The existing infrastructure is not adequate to handle two additional lots. The project would result in a change in the character of the neighborhood. He stated he doesn't think the required findings can be made.

Karen Orth of 300 Oak View Court is concerned about the possible damage to her property due to drainage. Her property is behind and below the applicant's property.

Judy Alberts of 226 Live Oak Street stated she feels the proposal would create too much density and would be of no benefit to anyone.

George Merrill of 294 Oak View Court said he would like for the area to remain rural.

Zack Schulz of 260 Live Oak Street asked how this project will affect the redwood and walnut trees on his property. He also expressed concern about the additional danger to children playing on the street.

Planner Geiger responded to the question about the trees. These are not trees that are protected by the Tree Ordinance, however the City would encourage the applicant to work with the neighbors to save the trees.

Larry Alberts of 226 Live Oak Street expressed concern about the water run-off from Andrews Street.

Karl Evensen of 245 Live Oak said he would like for the Commission to deny this project. He said the neighborhood is very old and there is no place to park.

Mike Warren of 222 Live Oak Street stated that he feels the flag lot is not a good idea.

Pam Pavlica of 320 Oak View said she is concerned about erosion on the hill.

Mr. Walker returned to the podium. When he purchased the property in the fall of 2005, he tried to avoid controversy. He apologized for offending anyone. He went to all of the government agencies prior to his application including the Planning Department, Fire Department and PCWA. He said the property is large enough to divide into 4 lots, and he thought by doing only three this would be acceptable to all concerned. The average size of his proposed parcels is about 11,000 square feet, which is larger than the existing neighboring parcels. He feels the parking is more than adequate since it will be off the street. He said that he wouldn't have to remove any trees for the proposed driveway and that he is not asking for any variances.

Comm. Smith asked Mr. Walker what the square footage of the proposed new homes will be.

Mr. Walker replied that it will probably be between 1600 and 2000 square feet.

The public hearing was closed.

Comm. Worthington stated she is opposed to the project due to increased drainage problems due to the addition of impervious surfaces, more traffic due to more residents, potential fire problems, and tree issues. She said she believes the subject property is not suitable for the proposed development.

Comm. Thompson asked about how the drainage issue can be addressed.

Bernie Schroeder of the Public Works Department stated that the Grading Ordinance requires that the property owner not adversely impact adjacent property owners.

Comm. Merz asked Ms. Schroeder if any conditions could be added to address the drainage issue.

Ms. Schroeder said that the problem is inherited, and each property owner takes care of drainage on their property.

Comm. Smith asked about the sewer problem.

Ms. Schroeder replied that it is not always a main line problem. There may be root problems affecting sewer laterals that serve individual properties and the area was the focus of several capital improvement projects in the past. This project would

create an advantage to the Public Works Department by the addition of the sewer access and easement on the property.

Comm. Kosla stated that he has concerns about the drainage issues and the additional parking. He believes the project will ultimately result in a benefit to the existing drainage situation. He suggests the addition of a good neighbor fence.

Comm. Smith asked Ms. Schroeder when the road was resurfaced.

Ms. Schroeder replied that it was 3 or 4 years ago.

The public hearing was re-opened.

Mr. Yeager returned to the podium to state that the reason the applicant did not hear from the neighbors sooner is that they were unaware of the project until they received notice ten days ago from the Planning Department about the meeting.

The public hearing was closed.

Chrm. Merz expressed concern about the existing narrow road. He feels that it is a good idea to add a sidewalk, however since the street is so narrow, it doesn't meet the conditions for sidewalks to be required.

Comm. Worthington **MOVED** to:

Amend Resolution No. 07-3 for denial of the Walker Lot Split (File LS 0-2) and the Tree Permit (File TP 06-5) based on the findings discussed tonight, and provide the amended Resolution for the Planning Commission's consideration at the March 20, 2007 meeting.

Comm. Merz **SECONDED**.

AYES: Smith, Worthington, Chrm. Merz
NOES: Kosla, Thompson
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

The applicant was advised that after the March 20, 2007 Planning Commission meeting, they will have 10 days to appeal the Commission's decision.

ITEM V: COMMISSION BUSINESS

- A. Amended and Restated Redevelopment Plan.** The Auburn Urban Development Authority (AUDA) requests that the Auburn Planning Commission adopt a Resolution which finds that the amended and restated redevelopment plan is consistent with the Auburn General Plan, revises the boundaries of the amendment area, and recommends approval of the amended and restated redevelopment plan by the Auburn City Council.

Comm. Worthington abstained from participating in this item due to her residence being within the Redevelopment area.

Planner Murray gave the staff report. The City of Auburn hired a consulting firm (GRC) to review the redevelopment plan.

The GRC consultant, Paul Schowalter presented an update about the Redevelopment Plan to the Commission.

Comm. Kosla **MOVED** to:

Adopt Planning Commission Resolution #07-4 which: 1) Finds that the amended and restated redevelopment plan is consistent with the Auburn General Plan; 2) Revises the boundaries of the amendment area; and 3) Recommends approval of the amended and restated redevelopment plan by the Auburn City Council.

Comm. Smith **SECONDED.**

AYES: Kosla, Smith, Thompson, Chrm. Merz
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Worthington
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

- B.** Consensus Memo for Planning Commission priorities.
This item was continued from the Planning Commission Hearing on February 20, 2007

Planner Murray gave the staff report. On January 22, 2007 the Planning Commission was given the option of submitting a consensus memo that outlines their recommendations to the City Council regarding priority planning issues and problems that need to be fixed. Individual Planning Commissioners are also free to submit their views to the City Council if a consensus document is not provided by the full Planning Commission.

On February 20, 2007, the Auburn Planning Commission reviewed the draft memo to City Council regarding the Commission's priority planning issues. The Commission determined that the scope of any update to the sign ordinance should be outlined in greater detail instead of leaving it to the discretion of the City Council.

Since the full Commission was not present on February 20th, the Commission continued the Consensus Memo to March 6th for additional discussion in front of the full Commission. Staff will amend the prepared memo based upon the Planning Commission's discussion and will forward the memo to the City Council on Monday, March 26, 2007.

The Commissioners discussed their areas of interest to be listed in the consensus memo. The issues discussed included:

- 1) The need to amend the entire zoning ordinance as well as historic design guidelines.
- 2) Sign issues should be reviewed City-wide.
- 3) Window signs should be regulated.
- 4) Enforcement is important and more should be done.
- 5) Work should be completed by the end of 2007.

Comm. Worthington **MOVED** to:

Submit to the City Council the consensus memo (Attachment 1) as modified by the discussion tonight.

Comm. Thompson **SECONDED**.

AYES: Kosla, Smith, Thompson, Worthington,
Chrm. Merz

NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

- C. Auburn Land Use Plans and Implementation with SACOG *Blueprint* comparison. *This item was continued from the Planning Commission hearing on February 20, 2007.*

Director Wong stated that this item requires extensive preparation work, and will be presented at a future Planning Commission meeting.

ITEM VI: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP REPORTS

- A. City Council Meetings
No Report
B. Future Planning Commission Meetings
There will be a Planning Commission meeting on March 20, 2007.
C. Reports
None

ITEM VII: PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS

Comm. Worthington suggested that the Commission choose liaisons within the Commission to attend different committee meetings that would be of interest to the Commission.

Director Wong stated that City Council decides which of the Council members are liaisons. Staff will e-mail the Planning Commissioners with the list of which Council members are liaisons for what organizations.

ITEM VIII: FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

None.

ITEM IX: ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Fraizer, Administrative Assistant